

Fulton, Robert D

From: Seestrom, Susan J
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 3:46 PM
To: Terry C. Wallace, Jr.
Subject: Re:

I am not sure we ever said we were not involved in the experiment. I think we probably said we were not involved in the specific diagnostic, which was a Livermore one. But I could be wrong. I certainly was not aware that a LANL person was co-PI of the experiment that used the diagnostic. We would not be on site if we were not involved in an experiment. There was a co-PI - not sure who.

I would say we have been honest, but maybe not either complete or clear.

I would say we probably relied on LLE for review of the safety aspects of the overall experiment and this diagnostic specifically.

I think the LLNL work on the diagnostic was shoddy and propably led to the event.

Finally - I would like to think we ought to have a role in making sure these things are done right if we are PI - and we did not.

S

On 3/14/11 2:32 PM, "Terry C. Wallace, Jr." <wallace.terrycjr@gmail.com> wrote:

I saw the explanation for the suit -- not too cool. I am assuming (a) the suit is totally bogus, and (b) we have not been honest about the lanl involvement in the experiment. Was it really a joint experiment? The report in all past communications state that lanl was on site, but not part of the experiment. If we were part of the experiment we better be much more forth coming than we have been. I don't doubt that no one from lanl did anything wrong, but if we are co-directing, then we better have taken that responsibility on.

t.

-
Susan J. Seestrom, Ph.D.
Associate Director for Experimental Physical Sciences
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Mail Stop A106
Los Alamos, NM 87544
(505) 665-4454 FAX (505) 665-1293